

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**PIN:** 5880  
**APPLICANT NAME:** City of Upland  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Upland Basin Expansion Project Phase 2

**FUNDS REQUESTED:** \$10,000,000  
**COST MATCH:** \$16,200,000  
**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$26,200,000

**DESCRIPTION:** The Project Recharge Basin is located at the upper end of the Chino Groundwater Basin. The project includes land acquisition and basin construction. The first phase included grading a portion of the site, exporting approximately 1 million yards of excess materials and construction of a 102" diameter storm drain. Phase I construction was completed in March 2005. Phase II construction would include remaining basin improvements (jurisdictional dam, spillway to the San Antonio Channel and disposal of unacceptable materials).

**Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.**

Pass

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.** 1

The applicant is submitting SAWPA's Santa Ana Integrated Watershed Program as their IRWMP. Inland Empire Utilities Agency (IEUA) is a member agency of SAWPA and the applicant is a member of IEUA. Assuming that the applicant can be considered a defacto member of SAWPA, applicant receives a score of 1 because it did not provide adequate proof of adoption. The adoption resolution that was submitted does not show any member agency signatures.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The region is the Santa Ana River Watershed and its planning agency is SAWPA. Many resources and characteristics of the watershed including hydrology, geomorphology, ecology, open space and recreation, water supply, water quality, flood control, social and cultural, demographics (population projections and DACs), and economics are discussed in IRWMP. Maps depicting various watershed characteristics are also provided. The applicant explains why region is appropriate for regional water management, describes water quantity and quality, and describes water supply and demand. Discussion of social and cultural topics could have been explicitly stated.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The IRWMP lists topics that will be updated to: 1) reflect regional issues, 2) describe long-term integrated solutions, adapt to changes in member and member sub-agencies planning, 3) review 2010, 2025, and 2050 of water demands and supplies, 4) identify a comprehensive mix of projects, 5) integrate available resources, 6) assure three years of groundwater storage is maintained in the Santa Ana River Basin by 2020, and 7) assure a salt balance. These topics were determined by a collaborative planning process that includes SAWPA, its member agencies, and other water resource agencies. Major water related issues were discussed, but no conflicts or impediments were mentioned.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

The applicant relies heavily on SAWPA's IRWMP content to satisfy these criteria and vaguely connects its proposal to IRWMP. The IRWMP listed six elements: water storage, water quality improvements, water recycling, flood protection, wetlands/environment/habitat, and recreation/conservation. Under each strategy, there were multiple projects to be implemented by SAWPA, its member agencies, and other local agencies. There was no discussion on why a strategy was not applicable to IRWMP or watershed. IRWMP discusses how these elements actually are individual ones from agencies and stakeholders in the watershed and SAWPA incorporated them as regional strategies. This approach results in a broad mix of strategies to be implemented in the watershed and serves individual agencies and regional objectives.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP listed 185 total projects from 50 entities. SAWPA selected priority projects using a 7-step evaluation and the priority projects were pared down to 20 out of 185. The long- and short-term priority discussions while ambitious are also general. The applicant does not discuss how decision making would respond to future changes, or how project sequencing would be altered based on implementation responses. Applicant did not demonstrate from project sequencing in the IRWMP why its project should move ahead of the IRWMP priority projects or the implementation schedule.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

2

IRWMP identified actions, projects, studies, and multiple task force activities that demonstrate implementation. IRWMP did not include individual schedules for the 19 priority projects or even the proposal to show sequence and timing of implementation. IRWMP included a schedule but it was not very useful because it showed grant funding cycles, not project schedules. Applicant provided a schedule for its project in another attachment but failed to show relationship to IRWMP schedule. IRWMP identified linkages between projects but applicant did not make this connection to its proposal. Economic and technical feasibility discussions were weak and not supported by documentation. IRWMP did not fully discuss current status of priority projects. IRWMP states SAWPA, member agencies, and other local entities are the institutional structures to ensure implementation.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP discusses how priority projects would provide potential positive impacts and multiple integrated benefits in region. An elaborate matrix shows how the priority projects will implement strategies and provide benefits. However, the discussion on integrated multiple benefits and negative impacts for the region could have been more concise. Brief discussions of evaluation of impacts/benefits to other resources are provided. The applicant recognized the Optimal Basin Management Plan (OBMP) as an important regional water management tool, and cites consistency of its proposal with the OBMP. The applicant also attached the OBMP Phase 1 Report to further illustrate the role and high priority of their proposal in overall implementation of the OBMP. The Applicant's proposal as part of the OBMP implements the Basin Plan, but the argument could be stronger.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP does not include a thorough discussion of data, technical methods, and analyses used in development of IRWMP. IRWMP briefly discussed plan performance as quantitative outcome indicators, qualitative goals, data gaps and use of database management system. IRWMP performance measures included CEQA review, schedule and budget tracking, site visits, documentation requirements, periodic review and evaluation, agreement deliverables, invoice procedures, audits, and project closeout procedures. However, these performance measures do not adequately address how the applicant and participating agencies will adapt to changes in project operation and implementation.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP states SAWPA, as administrator, will collect and provide project information/data, water quality and quantity information, maintain other programmatic information for analysis and future planning. SAWPA will also provide status reports to communicate efforts to the SWB and public. The IRWMP lists eight on-going monitoring programs. The IRWMP will support statewide data needs by integrating data with SWAMP and GAMA. SAWPA's database management system called SAWDMS would standardize data, enable agencies on-line data access, serve as tool to improve water quality, integrate surface and groundwater data to assist numerous programs. Yet, the applicant could have provided more information how they would use SAWDMS because it is a main IRWMP tool.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

There was no discussion of financing issues other than the IRWMP stating implementation is dependent on availability of outside funding. SAWPA stated it is actively seeking funding opportunities as they become available from Propositions 13 and 50, existing seed and partnership monies, agency general funds, program funds, and service fees. Funding sources and multiple partner agencies for each priority project were identified in the cost estimates, but it was not clear which entity or entities will actually fund each project. The applicant failed to address ongoing financing and other support for the future O&M of each priority project.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The IRWMP demonstrated coordination with local planning and management efforts. The IRWMP was developed in accordance with other applicable local and State plans including conservation, facilities, coastal, subregion, endanger species, environmental assessment, nutrient removal, watershed, and other plans and programs. The applicant states that the general plans for each of the watersheds three major counties and 59 cities form the cornerstone of policy development within the watershed.

**Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.** 5

The IRWMP demonstrated stakeholder involvement and coordination efforts are directed by SAWPA and its member agencies. A history of involvement and coordination with local, state, and federal level agencies were evident. Participation by grassroots organizations and DACs and environmental justice issues were addressed through the stakeholder process.

**Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.**

Pass

**Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.** 6

Applicant's one project is not an IRWMP priority project. Current basin volume is 700 AF and the purpose of Phase 2 is to increase volume to 1,050 AF for greater flood control protection and for imported water recharge storage capacity, and improved runoff conveyance. The project will meet basin goals of recharge goals of 1,100 AF/Y. Linkage to IRWMP was insufficient because emphasis was on a separate plan - the OBMP. Environmental Compliance was completed for the project but may be amended after final design is completed. The applicant stated that the proposal supports RWB initiatives and the NPS pollution plan, but did not support with documentation. The applicant did not discuss scientific basis, performance metrics, or source water protection.

**Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.** 2

There was no project prioritization discussion because the applicant's proposal consists of 1 project. The project is not a priority project for the IRWMP, but is listed in the IRWMP. There was insufficient information to understand the relationship of the proposal to IRWMP implementation. The applicant only explained how the project meets OBMP implementation. The applicant does not demonstrate why this project should move ahead of IRWMP schedule or be of higher importance than the other IRWMP priority projects.

**Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.** 4

Cost estimate shows only one project and it appears consistent with schedule. Project administration costs (0.07%), construction administration (3.6%), and construction/implementation contingencies (6.25%) seem reasonable. Matching funds equals 59.2%. The applicant does not show funded and unfunded portions of project. It is unclear if the cost estimate includes all phases or just Phase 2. The applicant does not discuss financing the final Phase 3 of proposed project.

**Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.** 3

Schedule shows only one project and it appears consistent with cost estimate, but does not show unfunded portions. The applicant explained five milestones that were not part of the schedule and explained which two milestones were included in schedule. Project duration is less than two years. The applicant did not demonstrate how or why related elements of the IRWMP will be completed on schedule. The applicant did not refer to IRWMP schedule to show how its proposal fits into larger picture.

**Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.** 8

The purpose of proposal is to increase basin volume to 1,050 AF for greater flood control protection and imported water recharge storage capacity. The applicant does not have drainage facilities for runoff. The new groundwater recharge capacities would meet the planned basin goals and long-term needs of OBMP. Also, the project would control runoff and remove gypsum materials in the basin which are related to elevated TDS levels that may potentially degrade groundwater quality. Economic impacts would be great if the region continues to rely on imported water supply. Environmental impacts have already been considered or mitigated by previously completed Phase 1 project. The applicant did not discuss project's relationship to IRWMP impacts and benefits or demonstrate integrated implementation.

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The IRWMP states all projects support to some extent DACs. The applicant states that the project is located in a disadvantaged tract but did not identify this tract. There are 11 eligible DAC tracts in the region. The applicant generally stated that project's DAC benefits included flood control and domestic water supply, but did not provide any specific details on direct benefits. Data for total population, DAC population, and Median Family Income (and not MHI) were provided, but no DAC calculations were provided according to PSP instructions.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The project generally meets Program Preferences. It would support and improve local and regional water supply reliability, contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards, and to provide safe drinking water and water quality projects serving DACs. The project is located within MWD service area, so it does not meet the groundwater project preference. This one-project proposal did not demonstrate integrated implementation, but it does demonstrate multiple benefits (storm water recharge, flood control, imported and recycled water recharge, and groundwater quality improvements).

TOTAL SCORE: 73
-----------------